

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,940	10/662,940 09/16/2003		Kimball C. Chen	64171.000002	2033
21967	7590	09/02/2005		EXAMINER	
HUNTON			BORISSOV, IGOR N		
		OPERTY DEPARTN	MENT		
1900 K STREET, N.W.				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1200				3639	
WASHING:	TON, DC	20006-1109			

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<u> </u>						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/662,940	CHEN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Igor Borissov	3639					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Se	eptember 2003.						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-432 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-432 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/662,940

Art Unit: 3639

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-432 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Taken as a whole the claims constitute *an undue multiplicity* of claims by virtue of the unreasonable number of claims presented which tend to confuse, obscure, and becloud the claimed invention. M.P.E.P. 2173.05(n) states:

Where, in view of the nature and scope of applicant's invention, applicant presents an unreasonable number of claims which ** are repetitious and multiplied, the net result of which is to confuse rather than to clarify, a rejection on undue multiplicity based on 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, may be appropriate. As noted by the court in *In re Chandler*, 319 F.2d 211, 225, 138 USPQ 138, 148 (CCPA 1963), "applicants should be allowed reasonable latitude in stating their claims in regard to number and phraseology employed. The right of applicants to freedom of choice in selecting phraseology which truly points out and defines their inventions should not be abridged. Such latitude, however, should not be extended to sanction that degree of repetition and multiplicity which beclouds definition in a maze of confusion. The rule of reason should be practiced and applied on the basis of the relevant facts and circumstances in each individual case." See also *In re Flint*, 411 F.2d 1353, 1357, 162 USPQ 228, 231 (CCPA 1969).

It is noted that most patents have less than twenty claims while patents in excess of 100 claims comprise less than 0.35% of all applications filed (See Federal Register: October 5, 1998 (Volume 63, Number 192, Page 53507). The examiner believes that this is due to the fact that twenty-five (25) claims are sufficient to properly define applicants' invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/662,940

Art Unit: 3639

In reply, Applicants are required to select certain Claims, not to exceed twenty-five for examination on the merits of which no more that six are independent claims, See M.P.E.P. 2173.05(n). To be complete **the non-selected claims must be cancelled** or the applicant(s) must present appropriate arguments as to why the above rejection is in error.

It is further noted that it would appear that a multiplicity of inventions also appear to be involved and the applicants are requested to group their selection accordingly to read on a single invention. The applicant should group the claims according to what he believes to be distinct inventions, which may be restricted in a subsequent action.

Due to the complexity of the case, Applicants are being afforded the courtesy of a written response.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Igor Borissov whose telephone number is 571-272-6801. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Igor Borissov

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3639

ΙB

8/24/2005